

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are now pending in the application. Claims 3, 5-9 and 12-16 have been allowed. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11 and 17 have been rejected. Claims 2, 4 and 10 have been amended herein. Claims 1 and 17 have been cancelled herein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the present amendments and the following remarks. The above amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, the noted element in Claims 1 and 10 has been removed from these claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Benedetto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,209,544). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, dependent Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to be dependent to Claim 3. Therefore, Claims 2 and 4 should now be condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicants' representative has amended independent Claim 10 to essentially include the limitations of dependent Claim

17 to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claims 10 and 11 should now be in condition for allowance.

All claim amendments not specifically discussed herein have been made to either broaden the claim or to improve grammar and not to overcome any cited references. Therefore, all of these claim amendments should be entitled to their whole range of equivalents.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 08/09/2004

By:

Monte L. Falcoff
Reg. No. 37,617
Michael J. Lang
Reg. No. 51,120

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MLF/MJL/csd

Serial No.10/721,960

Page 9 of 9